

## **REMARKS**

This is in response to the Office Action dated July 28, 2005. In view of the foregoing amendments and following representations, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Initially, the specification has been amended to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner on page 2 of the Office Action. Also, as required by the Examiner, the language "(Light Emitting Diode)" has been inserted on page 2, line 9 of the specification to explain the meaning of the abbreviation LED.

Next, on pages 2-3 of the Office Action, claims 2-3, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The Examiner is requesting an explanation of when tablets cannot be fed from the mounting base.

Reference is made to page 26, line 28 to page 27, line 3 of the specification which states:

"The protrusion 303 is detected by the sensor 301a, i.e., the closes condition of the shutter 300 is detected by the sensor 301a, whereby the tablets can be fed from the motor base 342. However, after the tablets are discharged in the tablet reserving member, the tablets can not be used from the motor base 32 unless the opened condition of the shutter 300 is detected."

Accordingly, it is clear that the tablets cannot be fed from the mounting base (32) unless the open condition and subsequent closed condition of the shutter (203, 300) is detected by the sensor. Accordingly, it is submitted that the language of the rejected claims is clearly enabled by the description in the specification. In other words, the sentence cited by the Examiner on page 27, when read with the proceeding sentence,

clearly supports the language of claims 2-3, 6 and 7. In view of the above, the Examiner is requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 2-3, 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Next, in response to rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, the claims have been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Also, each of the recited elements are now provided with proper antecedent basis. In view of the clarifying amendments made to claims 1-7, it is submitted that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is now clearly obviated.


Next, on pages 3-5 of the Office Action, claims 1-7 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting rejection as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,644,504 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,259. In response, a Terminal Disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(c) is submitted herewith to overcome the obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the present application is now clearly in condition for allowance. The Examiner therefore is requested to pass this case to issue.

In the event that the Examiner has any comments or suggestions of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney by telephone to promptly resolve any remaining matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Shoji YUYAMA et al.

By: 

Michael S. Huppert  
Registration No. 40,268  
Attorney for Applicants

MSH/kjf  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
December 28, 2005